REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the Application. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons stated below and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

The Applicants respectfully assert that the amendment to claims 1, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 20, and 21, and incorporated by reference in any claims depending therefrom, are not narrowing amendments made for a reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent that will give rise to prosecution history estoppel. *See Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*, 56 U.S.P.Q.2d 1865, 1870 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

I.   REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e):

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Singer et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0125531 A1), hereafter referred to as *Singer*. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons stated below and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

For a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102, each and every claim limitation <u>must</u> be found within the cited prior art reference and arranged as required by the claim. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants respectfully assert that *Singer* does not disclose "starting a log file parser on each server of a set of servers in a distributed information processing environment" and "retrieving usage information from a database file generated by said log file parser" as recited in the method of claim 1, the computer program product of claim 8, and the data processing system of claim 15. Regarding the first

step, the Examiner cites ¶[0008-0009, 0054] of *Singer* as disclosing the above-cited claim limitations. *See* Office Action from 06/17/2005, p. 2, lines 18-20. Applicants respectfully traverse. *Singer* does disclose a "system for collecting, filtering, analyzing and reporting web server usage data" (*Singer* ¶[0008]), and a process by which "web server usage data can be collected from multiple servers" (*Singer* ¶[0009]). However, the collection process of Singer does not contain the elements in claims 1, 8, and 15 of <u>starting a log file parser</u> and <u>generating a database file by said log file parser</u>. The method disclosed by Singer begins with a pre-installed filtering program on each web server for locally generating a customized, filtered log file. *Singer* ¶[0051]. In the method of *Singer*, the Collection Server then starts a Collection Program that locally compresses the filtered log files (using WinZip V 6.3) and transfers these zipped files to the Analysis Server. *Singer* ¶[0054]. Hence, *Singer* discloses the collection, transfer, and management of filtered log files. There is no language in *Singer* regarding <u>generating a database file</u>, on each server by a <u>log file parser</u>. Thus, *Singer* does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 1, 8, and 15 and thus *Singer* does not anticipate claims 1, 8, and 15. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that *Singer* does not disclose "closing a current log file", "reading said log file", and "generating said database file in response to said log file," as recited in the method of claim 2, the computer program product of claim 9, and the data processing system of claim 16. The Examiner cites ¶[0054, 0057-0060, 0061-0066] of *Singer* as disclosing the above-cited claim limitations. *See* Office Action from 06/17/2005, p. 3, lines 7-9. Applicants respectfully traverse. *Singer* instead discloses that a filtering program locally generates a customized, filtered log file. *Singer* ¶[0051]. The filtering program also periodically deletes outdated records in the filtered log file with their related data and files *Singer* ¶[0052]. In the method of *Singer*, the Collection Server then starts a Collection Program that locally compresses the filtered log files (using WinZip V 6.3) and transfers these zipped files to the Analysis Server. *Singer* ¶[0054]. Hence, *Singer* discloses the collection,

transfer, and management of filtered log files. However, there is no language in *Singer* regarding closing or reading the current log file, or generating a database file in response to said log file on each server. Thus, *Singer* does not disclose the limitations of claims 2, 9, and 16 and thus *Singer* does not anticipate claims 2, 9, and 16. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that *Singer* does not disclose "starting a next log file" as recited in the method of claim 3, the computer program product of claim 10, and the data processing system of claim 17. The Examiner cites ¶[0065] of *Singer* as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. *See* Office Action from 06/17/2005, p. 3, line 12. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that *Singer* instead discloses locally creating filtered log files and periodically deleting outdated records and related data from the filtered log files. The cited passage by the Examiner discloses repetition of the entire analysis method in *Singer* for each server, and thus is irrelevant to claims 3, 10, and 17. There is no language in the cited passage that discloses starting a next log file on each server. Thus, *Singer* does not disclose the limitations of claims 3, 10, and 17 and thus *Singer* does not anticipate claims 3, 10, and 17. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that *Singer* clearly does not disclose "closing a current log file", "reading said log file", "generating said database file" and does not disclose that these steps "are performed by said log file parser" as recited in the method of claim 4, the computer program product of claim 11, and the data processing system of claim 18. The Examiner cites ¶[0017] of *Singer* as disclosing the above-cited claim limitations. *See* Office Action from 06/17/2005, p. 3, lines 13-16. Applicants respectfully traverse. *Singer* teaches a method clearly distinct from the above-cited claim limitations, "the collection process collects the filtered usage records from all the servers on the system, further processes the usage data, and then transfers the data to the Analysis Server where the data is loaded into a relational database." *Singer* ¶[0017]. Hence, *Singer* discloses the collection, transfer, and

management of filtered log files and discloses generating a database file after the usage data have been retrieved in filtered form. There is no language in *Singer* regarding closing or reading the current log file locally, i.e. on each server. Neither does *Singer* mention generating a database file <u>with a file parser on each server</u>, as is clearly recited in the parent claims 1, 8, and 15, respectively. Thus, *Singer* does not disclose the limitations of claims 4, 11, and 18 and thus *Singer* does not anticipate claims 4, 11, and 18. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that *Singer* does not disclose "launching a log file browser" and "retrieving usage information from a database file" as recited in the method of claim 5, the computer program product of claim 12, and the data processing system of claim 19. The Examiner cites ¶[0065] of *Singer* as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. *See* Office Action from 06/17/2005, p. 4, line 3. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that *Singer* instead merely discloses repeating the entire analysis method for each server. *Singer* does disclose a "system for collecting, filtering, analyzing and reporting web server usage data" *Singer* ¶[0008], and a process by which "web server usage data can be collected from multiple servers" *Singer* ¶[0009]. However, the collection process of Singer does not contain the elements in claims 1, 8, and 15 (as restated in claims 5, 12, and 19, respectively) of "starting a log file parser" and "generating a database file by said log file parser." The method disclosed by Singer begins with a pre-installed filtering program on each web server for locally generating a customized, filtered log file. *Singer* ¶[0051]. In the method of *Singer*, the Collection Server then starts a Collection Program that locally compresses the filtered log files (using WinZip V 6.3) and transfers these zipped files to the Analysis Server. *Singer* ¶[0054]. Hence, *Singer* discloses the collection, transfer, and management of filtered log files. There is no language in *Singer* regarding <u>generating a database file</u> on each server by a <u>log file parser</u>. Thus, *Singer* does not disclose the limitations of claims 5, 12, and 19 and thus *Singer* does not anticipate claims 5, 12, and 19. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that *Singer* does not disclose steps that are "performed by a shell script" as recited in the method of claim 6, the computer program product of claim 13, and the data processing system of claim 20. The Examiner cites ¶[0100-0103] of *Singer* as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. *See* Office Action from 06/17/2005, p. 4, lines 8-9. Applicants respectfully traverse. *Singer* teaches a method clearly distinct from the above-cited claim limitations, "[i]nstalling the SQL database on the Analysis Server consists of three database scripts which must be run in the following order: (1) Create Tables Script, (2) Create Views Script, and (3) Stored Procedures Script." *Singer* ¶[0100]. Hence, *Singer* discloses initializing a database environment by running SQL (Structured Query Language) scripts. There is no language in *Singer* regarding running shell scripts, i.e. bsh, bash, ksh, csh, tsch, as defined in the disclosure (Detailed Description, p. 8, lines 3-5). Thus, *Singer* does not disclose the limitations of claims 6, 13, and 20 and thus *Singer* does not anticipate claims 6, 13, and 20. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that *Singer* does not disclose log files that "are maintained by a directory server" as recited in the method of claim 7, the computer program product of claim 14, and the data processing system of claim 21. The Examiner cites ¶[0043] of *Singer* as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. *See* Office Action from 06/17/2005, p. 4, lines 12-13. Applicants respectfully traverse. *Singer* teaches a method clearly distinct from the above-cited claim limitations, "[t]he three types of computer systems which are utilized by the invention include: (1) web servers, (2) Collection Server, and (3) an Analysis Server." *Singer* ¶[0043]. Hence, *Singer* discloses and claims a web site usage data collection, analysis and reporting system wherein the log files are maintained by web servers. *Singer* ¶[0041, 0002-0007, 0008, 0009, 0010, 0048, 0050-0055, 0065, ABSTRACT]. There is no language in *Singer* regarding directory servers, or any other kind of network server, except for web servers. Directory servers are well appreciated in the art as being distinct and separate from web servers.

directory server - a network server that provides a directory, or naming service. (http://www.techweb.com/encyclopedia/defineterm.jhtml?term=directory+server&x=20&y=7)

directory service - a directory service organizes computerized content and runs on a directory server computer. It is not to be confused with the directory itself, which is the database that holds the information about objects that are to be managed by the directory service. The directory service is the interface to the directory and provides access to the data that is contained in that directory. It acts as a central authority that can securely authenticate resources and manage identities and relationships between them. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Directory_server)

Hence, a method that operates solely on a web server does not anticipate and is patentably distinct from a method that operates on a directory server. Thus, *Singer* does not disclose the limitations of claims 7, 14, and 21, and thus *Singer* does not anticipate claims 7, 14, and 21. M.P.E.P. §2131.

As a result of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully assert that not each and every claim limitation was found within the cited prior art reference, and thus claims 1-21 are not anticipated by *Singer*.

II. CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that claims 1-21 in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an allowance of such claims. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call Applicants' attorney at the below listed number if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.

Attorney for Applicants

By: _____
Kelly K. Kordzik
Reg. No. 36,571

P.O. Box 50784
Dallas, TX 75201
(512)370-2832

13